

Indiana University
UNIVERSITY FACULTY COUNCIL
March 23, 2010
1:30 P.M. - 4:30 P.M. (EST)

IUB: Franklin Hall Room 106
IUE: Springwood, Room 202D
IPFW: Helmke Library Room B37
IUPUI: ICTC Building Room 541
IUK: Main Building Room 111
IUN: Hawthorne Hall Room 338
IUSB: Northside Hall Room 075b
IUS: Knobview Hall Room 112

MEMBERS: Simon Atkinson, Carol Baird, Jason Baird Jackson, Karen Banks, Karl Besel, Stephen Burns, Janice Cox, Erika Dowell, Mary Fisher, Charles Gallmeier, Stuart Green, Karen Hanson, Jerry Hinnefeld, Brian Horne, Eugene McGregor, Michael McRobbie, Laverne Nishihara, Robert Noel, C. Subah Packer, Nasser Paydar, Jonathan Plucker, John Minor Ross, Fran Squires, Ellen Szarleta, Herb Terry, David Vollrath, Leslie Walker, Joe Wert, Michael Wolf

MEMBERS ABSENT WITH ALTERNATES PRESENT:

MEMBERS ABSENT: Jodie Atkinson, Charles Bantz, Teri Belecky-Adams, Bruce Bergland, Jacqueline Blackwell, Terri Bourus, Christopher Bradley, Nick Clark, Jan Fulton, Brady Harmon, Lesa Hatley Major, Jennifer Hehman, Patricia Henderson, Hitesh Kathuria, Paul Losensky, Joyce MacKinnon, Bryan McCormick, Mary Beth Minick, Michael Nusbaumer, Sandra Patterson-Randles, Jamie Prenkert, Elizabeth Raff, Una Mae Reck, Simon Rhodes, Alan Schmetzer, Robert Schnabel, Peter SerVaas, Jodi Smith, Michael Wartell

GUESTS: John Applegate (VPRUAPP), Barbara Bichelmeyer (AVP-URAPP), Michael Coleman (IUSA), Craig Dethloff (Faculty Council Office), Harold Evans (IUB-Physics), Tom Gieryn (IUB VPFAA), Mike Leonard (Herald-Times), Lois Scheidt (Faculty Council Office), Neil Theobald (VP & CFO)

Agenda

1. Approval of Minutes
<http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/minutes/AY10/11.24.09.pdf>
<http://www.indiana.edu/~pres/speeches/022310.shtml>
2. Presiding Officer's Business (20 minutes)
(President Michael McRobbie)

3. Agenda Committee Business (20 minutes)
(Co-Secretaries Simon Atkinson and Erika Dowell)
4. Question/Comment Period* (10 minutes)
(President McRobbie and Co-Secretaries Atkinson and Dowell)
5. Core School Deans Review Policy (20 minutes)
(Professor Jonathan Plucker, Chair of the Core School Deans Review Policy Committee)[ACTION ITEM]
<http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/circulars/AY10/U4-2010.pdf>
6. Discussion of University Budget Issues (30 minutes)
(Neil Theobald, VP and CFO) [DISCUSSION]
<http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/addDocs/AY10/FinancePres.pdf>
7. Proposed Changes to the Tenure Clock in the Indiana University School of Medicine (20 minutes)
(Co-Secretary Simon Atkinson) [DISCUSSION]
<http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/addDocs/AY10/IUSMTenPol.pdf>
<http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/addDocs/AY10/TenQA.pdf>
<http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/addDocs/AY10/IUSMTenRep.pdf>
8. Constitutional Reform of the University Faculty Council (20 minutes)
(Co-Secretaries Simon Atkinson and Erika Dowell) [DISCUSSION]

*Faculty who are not members of the Faculty Council and who wish to address questions to President McRobbie and co-Secretaries Atkinson and Dowell should submit their questions to the Faculty Council Office at ufcoff@indiana.edu. Meetings are open to the public. Our documents are available at: <http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc>.

Minutes

MCROBBIE: Okay, everything's alright. Well, let's get started.

AGENDA ITEM 1: APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MCROBBIE: The first item of business is the approval of the minutes from the last meeting. Any comments first on the minutes from the last meeting? Any comments, questions from anybody about the minutes? Can I have a motion for adoption please? And a second? Any comments or questions on that motion? I'll put the motion. All those in favor of adopting the minutes from last meeting signify by saying 'Aye.' [Aye] Against? No, and that's carried. Sorry, we have a bit of latency with the other campuses.

AGENDA ITEM 2: PRESIDING OFFICER'S BUSINESS

MCROBBIE: I'll move on to Agenda Item 2 which is the Presiding Officer's Business. I've got some issues I just want to comment on firstly and then some of these matters are going to be elaborated on by others and I'll ask John Applegate in particular to comment on one of them. Firstly, just a few words on the financial situation more generally. Neil – is Neal here yet, by the way? I know he's coming. He's coming later. The financial situation in the state, I don't know if I quite want to say continues to deteriorate, but it has deteriorated since we last met. The revenue figure for the last month was below our prediction. There's still a concern as to whether the recession has bottomed out in the state. It seems that maybe it has elsewhere in certain other parts of the country. It's unclear whether it has in Indiana. This means, I think, that we need to be – as I've said numerous times – we need to be concerned about possible future further budget cuts. I don't think we're out of the woods yet in that regard. So the kinds of actions and scrutiny that we're engaging in with respect to expenditure of the university I think is going to just have to continue for a while longer, but Neal is going to talk more about that when he arrives. Secondly, we announced this morning – you may have seen the news releases that were released earlier this morning – that we've appointed a chancellor at Kokomo and that's Michael Harris who is at the moment the provost and VP for academic affairs at Kettering U. and he'll be taking up his position I think on the first of July.

APPLEGATE: Right.

MCROBBIE: And then secondly at IU Northwest we appointed William Lowe who is the Provost and VP for academic affairs at Metropolitan State University in St. Paul in Minnesota. Both are very experienced in their roles and I think two excellent appointments to the chancellor roles and I have to commend the two search committees. The search committees were just excellent. I think they did a really first rate job and I must commend Chancellor Paydar who chaired the search committee for Kokomo and Vice President Marshall who chaired the search committee for Northwest for the quality of the job that they did and for the quality of the job that all the members – all the faculty, staff and students on those committees – the quality of the job that they did really was first rate as well.

Then thirdly – in an area that's related – it has been the case I would say maybe in the last six months to a year that there has been growing attention in the state being paid to the regional campuses. And the question being asked is what is the right role for regional campuses – not just the IU regional campuses but those of Purdue as well – in the state. And this culminated in a mission statement for regional campuses in the state that was developed by the higher ed commission and to some extent, those of you who read this will notice that it tends to define the regional—this is a little overstated, but it's true to some extent – that it tends to define the regional campuses a little bit by exception. I think that the commission has a good understanding of what the major

campuses do and a good understanding of what Ivy Tech does and somehow the regional campuses fill a middle area that's not quite as well defined as one would like to see it. And given that, and given the fact that both the legislature and the government, the higher ed commission and so on are looking at expenditures on higher education in the state, I thought it was important that we began to grapple more proactively with this issue. And consequently I am mindful of the fact that with everything else I have on my plate I can only give so much attention to the regional campuses. And I think they simply just need more attention from University Administration than it's been possible for me to give them. And I've visited most campuses, all campuses, multiple times and probably have done more so than has been done for a while. So I also announced a few weeks ago the appointment of John Applegate to the position, with the somewhat lengthy title of Vice President for University Regional Affairs, Planning, and Policy. And the regional chancellors will report to me through John, and John will then be responsible for, I think, day-to-day operational matters and the result of this will be John will be able to give the regional campuses a lot more attention than is simply realistically feasible for me to be able to give to the campuses. And I think this has the effect of bringing the regional campuses more closely – well, binding them more closely into the university and certainly not the converse as well. And that was effective immediately with the announcement and John is going to visit all the campuses in the next, I'd say, month or so and will be at Northwest at the end of this week. And I think will aim to visit every other campus soon afterwards as well.

And then finally, I know, a lot of you were at my state of the university speech and maybe some of you had seen it as well. I did make a series of significant announcements in that speech, but I do want to just comment on the announcement that we'll be establishing – and really this is principally relevant to Bloomington and IUPUI – a committee to be chaired by the provost and Chancellor Bantz called New Academic Directions looking at the academic offerings of the university, the way that we're structured and a variety of other issues and seeing really if there are opportunities there that we haven't taken advantage of and whether there are new academic directions that we should be looking at, how we might take advantage of those and maybe commence new initiatives in some of those areas. And I'd hope to get that established in the next month or so, as well. At the same time, I've also asked all the chancellors and the provost to establish what I'm calling New Directions in Learning Committees which are focused very much on how we teach undergraduate education on all the campuses and how we can ensure the effectiveness of what we do; partly to try to get ahead of the issue that is also becoming fairly dominant out there which is one of how do we actually measure that out. How do we know and how are we able to confirm that students have the qualifications and the expertise that we would like to believe they have and so on. And there's growing concern about that issue you see expressed nationally on a regular basis and within the state as well. I think we need to sort of proactively be grappling with that at a level of the campuses as well. And then finally I strongly encouraged the leaders of faculty governance – and faculty governance more generally – to have a look at the structures of faculty governance and to start to

ask, you know, are they really the best structures that we could have in place? Are they as efficient as they could be? Do they contribute to what one thinks of as the extremely important role of faculty governance in the best ways throughout the institution? I won't go into that in detail because I described it in my speech but I know that Erika and Simon and, I believe, others have welcomed this and we've already had some discussions on it and I believe that actions are now being taken on having a look at the way faculty governance has functioned and its structures within the institution as well.

So those are just some comments and much of that you've already seen in announcements. I just wanted to sum it up. And John would you like to comment on your new role and the position of regional campuses and some of the issues that are present there at the moment?

APPLEGATE: Sure, I'll be brief and certainly happy to answer any questions people might have. To follow up a bit on what the president was saying, I think there are really two kinds of reasons to create this new role. The first set is what you might call reactive ones. That is, reacting to the interests and I would say concern within the state government – in various pieces of the state government – including the Commission on Higher Education about the role of the regional campuses. I think it's fair to say that there is not a complete understanding of the great value that the regional campuses bring to the state or how, in an affirmative sense, they contribute to the state's goals of producing more high quality baccalaureate degrees which is a major goal that the state commission has, as well as the other parts of the state government – asking hard questions about graduation rates, cost per student, and so on. That is a fairly mild version of some of the concerns that are out there. Not fully appreciating, I think, the difference between the university and community college types of education, seeing them as largely interchangeable – which I think is a misunderstanding and one that we need to address – and of course in an environment in which there are extreme fiscal limitations, anything that can be seen as lowering the cost of any publicly provided good, including higher education, either to the state or to the consumers of the good or both is jumped at. And so it seems very important – and we had a real opportunity – to craft a positive, affirmative, strong vision for the role that the regional campuses have both within the university and within the Indiana system of higher education. Craig has posted and distributed two documents relevant to that. The first is the policy on the regional campuses that was adopted two Fridays ago by the Commission on Higher Education. That is a final document and it defines really the area within which we operate. I don't think it contains any surprises. I'm sure if we had written it ourselves we would have written it in some different ways, but the basic defining characteristics, the basic expectations, are ones that are familiar from the commission's strategic plan called "Reaching Higher," and represents I would even say from my point of view, an improvement over some previous suggestions that the commission's role was to actually create mission statements for the individual campuses. I think the commission has wisely chosen to allow individual campuses and universities to define those missions themselves within the four corners of the document they've produced. What is missing

though, as the president indicated, from that is a strong affirmative statement of what is the core strength, what is the core mission and vision for the regional campuses? I think the commission is very open to that. I know the commission is very open to that, and very open to the university taking a lead in doing that. And that is the second document that was posted and circulated called the provisional version of a “Shared Vision.” That document I see as the proactive – I hate that word – but the proactive part of creating this new position and portfolio which is to define those areas of commonality among the regional campuses. What we know from the past decades is that the regional campuses have accomplished defining individual identities. They have their own characters and that is probably one of their greatest strengths, having that individual identity to them. That’s what is and ought to be and certainly will be their stock in trade in the higher education system in Indiana for years to come. At the same time there are common features of the regional campuses which are important to those campuses, important to the university, and important to the state higher education system as a whole and this document is a first attempt at trying to define those so that we can begin the process – or continue the process – of presenting a unified, strong, core idea of the regional campuses. One that will avoid confusion with other pieces of the higher education system, and I think basically that is necessary for the regional campuses separately and together to fly. The vision document obviously reflects in many ways the characteristics and expectations that the commission has laid out for us. Those are things that we must respond to, and again I think most of them are things that we would all agree are well worth responding to and doing as well as we can with. But I formally here invite your comments on this. I think having comments through the faculty governance organizations of each of the campuses is perhaps the most efficient and effective way to do that, and I would very much like to hear from you. But I see this as not a legislative document so to speak, rather a vision – a description – of the common features of the regional campuses and very much understanding that the individual characteristics of each campus will remain critical parts of their role in the state.

AGENDA ITEM 3: AGENDA COMMITTEE BUSINESS

MCROBBIE: Okay, thanks. We can take questions on that under four, but that’s all I had to say. Agenda Item 3, Erika and Simon? Simon?

ATKINSON: Unmute it and it’ll work better. I’ll just go over what the Agenda Committee has been discussing over the last couple of months. A couple of items are actually on the agenda for today so I won’t go into those and that’s the IUPUI tenure track flexibility policy and the future of the UFC, the future of university wide faculty governance. We also started the process of looking to follow up on last year’s promotion and tenure procedures, principles document. Those of you who were on UFC last year will remember that that document asked all campuses to look at their promotion and tenure procedures in light of a set of principles that were endorsed by the university affecting things like the composition of the review committees so the campuses have now had a year to take a look at their processes and see whether it’s

appropriate to make some modifications in those processes to accommodate those principles in the context of the particular situations of each campus. Hopefully at the April meeting we'll be able to get some kind of sense of how that is going on the whole campuses. The other component of that document was to ask the president to take a look at the process of executive review. This is the decision making process once the dossiers have reached the campus chancellor and the central administration. So I think we would like to hear about that at the April meeting.

We've also – as a sort of follow-up to Chancellor Bantz's review – we had a very preliminary discussion about the review process. I think there was a feeling amongst the review that on the IUPUI campus the process was somewhat cumbersome and took an immense amount of [electronic noise, remark inaudible] from the committee members and from the other people in the system. We did have a preliminary discussion as to whether that might be something that we'd want to take a look at again. I will say that the regional campus representatives on the Agenda Committee who have hired a chancellor [inaudible] would out of the context of the regional campuses so it may be something that works well in one setting but not perhaps in the setting of a large campus. I think that is about all we have discussed. Erika do you have anything to add?

DOWELL: I just wanted to follow up on the responses from campuses for the promotion and tenure principles that we asked for responses from campuses by April 1st so that we can get them compiled and get ready for the meeting. So if your campus hasn't responded, send things to Craig.

AGENDA ITEM 4: QUESTION/COMMENT PERIOD

MCROBBIE: Okay, thank you Simon and Erika. Agenda item 4: any questions for myself or Simon or Erika or maybe John given he spoke during my report as well? Any questions? Comments? Herb?

TERRY: I actually – it's probably something the regional campus people should say – but I'll offer it. One of the things I've learned in the last couple of years, is the amount and quality of research that's done by the faculty of the regional campuses. I'm impressed at what they do. They confront higher teaching loads than what we do in Bloomington, they don't have the graduate students that we have and that sort of thing, and many of them are very dedicated to quality research. And I'm just a little concerned about the way the research activities at the regional campuses is described in the higher education commission document where you can argue that there are restraints imposed on the academic freedom of faculty and the efforts to define research as only scholarly activity relating to faculty teaching responsibilities or research related to local and regional needs. You can stretch that. You can argue that almost any research that somebody does is kind of related to their teaching responsibilities; maybe you want to do that. I like it, in your statement, that you talk about opportunities for undergraduate research

because there are lots of those at the regional campuses but they don't happen independently of faculty research in most cases. And so I would hope in dealing with the commission and dealing with others, you know, that yes, some research will go on on the regional campuses and will be directly related to local and regional needs, but in many of our areas, it may not be. It may be related to the faculty member's discipline and that sort of thing, and I hope to the extent you can, you keep that at the forefront. These campuses are all faculty of Indiana University.

APPLEGATE: Again, when Barb Bichelmeyer and I were visiting all of the campuses over the course of the fall and I guess early spring, before the change in portfolio, one of the things that we heard loud and clear was the importance of research, and particularly undergraduate research, on the regional campuses. I think that is very important to the extent that one of the issues in the larger system for the state is, how is a regional campus different from the community college experience? Something that from the inside feels very obvious, from the outside, not necessarily so. I think that's clearly one of those things. And I appreciate you picking that up, because that was put in that document very deliberately, that is, the vision document. I would say that my own interpretation of the commission's document is that it states what it is that the commission is going to, in effect, reward. There is, for example, in the budget formula, a research incentive award that is available to the major research campuses of Indiana, of all of the three major ones. And I take this as a statement, for example, that that kind of funding is not anticipated for the regional campuses. I don't take it as an indication that the commission is going to investigate what individual faculty are doing in their research time and making sure that their research is somehow directly related to it. I take it more as saying, 'You need to think about how your research contributes to what the commission is telling us is the primary mission which is one of teaching.' And I think undergraduate research is a wonderful example of how those two things go hand in hand.

GREEN: John?

APPLEGATE: Yeah?

GREEN: This is Stuart Green from the Kokomo campus. I think Herb makes a good point, but I want to point out also that in the provisional version of the shared vision statement that we all worked on with you, John, that there is a statement in that that implies that faculty will engage in a broader range of research than just research related to their regions. And it states, in paragraph last, "All academic programs will be distinguished by ready access to full-time faculty who are active and expert in their respective fields of study." That basically says that these are people who are active in the field of study in which they have their terminal degrees. It then goes on to say that they're committed to another range of activities including student success in the classroom, but it specifies that the faculty of the regional campuses are active in their respective fields of study which in our world means they're active in research and that

research can certainly connect to the regions, and in many instances it should – it's appropriate for it to do so – but it also implies that their research interests may be broader within their respective fields of study. So I think that was there, as I understand it, to speak not against what the commission is going to reward but to provide an addendum to what the regional campuses will be doing with respect to their research.

MCROBBIE: Thanks, Stuart. Other questions or comments from anybody? Alright, let's move on to Agenda Item 5, the Core School Deans Review Policy. Professor Plucker?

AGENDA ITEM 5: CORE SCHOOL DEANS REVIEW POLICY

PLUCKER: Thank you. We last brought this to you as an information item – I can't remember – a long time ago. We finished our work on this draft in the middle of December. This is our first meeting for action item since. Since we last met, I believe at the time that we had shared this with you last which was October-ish—Craig does that sound right?—Craig and the task force had taken the IUPUI policy for dean administrative review and the Bloomington policy and sort of put them together taking the best parts from each and then essentially smoothing it over. We presented it to a number of different groups. This group, BFC, I believe IFC saw it, we met with the provost and the chancellor a couple times each to go over sticking points and things like that. We got a lot of comments and we have revised, revised, revised. I think the only—Jack are you up at Indianapolis?

DOWELL: Yes.

PLUCKER: Yes? I can see his ear. Yes, there he is. I believe Jack was the only other member of the task force who I see present right now, so Jack feel free to jump in. The major concerns when we started; if I had to boil them down to a few sentences, the first was to make sure that there was sufficient representation of faculty from both campuses whenever we're doing a core dean review and the second was to make sure that there was plenty of –for lack of a better term—due process for the person being reviewed. And I think we did accomplish that. We also strove to try to put principles in place – I'm not sure exactly how to word this so I'll just say it – that it was less about personality and more about the administrator's effectiveness. And we thought that the previous policies on both campuses – and quite frankly especially the case on the Bloomington campus – did leave it open to be a personality contest a little bit more than it probably should have. And so with that in mind, the document you have in front of you is what we could do.

MCROBBIE: This – I guess this is coming up for adoption Jonathan. That's –

PLUCKER: I believe so.

MCROBBIE: Right, and coming from your committee that probably doesn't need a motion—it doesn't need a mover and a seconder. I think that's just coming directly to the committee so I think we should regard the policy as being in front of the UFC for discussion and for action, and voting on. So at this point let me just call for a discussion on that motion effectively. Discussion, yes?

GIERYN: Jonathan could you elaborate? Looking at points 9 and 10, the sequence of the relationship between what's stated in the last sentence of point 9, "A final report may be made public at the discretion of the dean reviewed," and then the first sentence of point 10 which says that there'll be a decision made about what is to be included in the public summary document. If a dean chooses a sequence of – or really the timing of the events is what I'm curious about.

PLUCKER: Gotcha.

GIERYN: If the dean chooses to reveal the final report, what then is the point of the summary document? It emphasizes certain things for sure – so if you could talk a little bit more about how you anticipated the relationship between those two releases of information.

PLUCKER: It's a very good question. Thank you, Tom. Well, I guess there's a technical response and then there's a more substantive response. Technically, item 9 is where we were talking about what happens to the final report which is why it was slapped on there. It could, it probably could be a new item 11, just that last sentence after 10, but... Substantively, I think the difference between the summary and the final report is that the summary has been processed on this campus it would be by the provost, up in Indianapolis it would be by the chancellor, to give a sense of what next steps are and sort of you know, yes, we are discussing this. And that's also the opportunity for the presiding campus academic officer to be able to also suddenly and yet still directly acknowledge all of the people who did give input. So it's not just the final report being out there and people saying, 'Okay, great. But what's going to happen with this?' It is the provost and/or chancellor saying 'Here's what's going to happen with this. Here's a summary as I see it and here's what our next steps are going to be.' Although it doesn't need to be that either, I suppose. And so, I do see them as substantively different. I'm trying to think to the last time I know that a dean actually released one and the dean did release it but at that point I believe Ken Gros Louis was chancellor and he did provide a summary to the BFC at least. And it was a core school dean, six, seven years ago now was the last that I know of it happening. And in his summary, he just essentially gave the abstract but gave a couple sentences on what he and the dean were working on next which is substantively different than just releasing the final report. And there always may be a case, right, where the provost may disagree with the conclusions of the final report and that is her or his opportunity to say so.

MCROBBIE: Other comments or questions? Herb?

TERRY: A question about timing. The document presumes, I think, that deans begin their office July 1 or at the start of fall semester or something like that. We recently had an instance here where a dean started in January. When does the year in these calendars start running?

PLUCKER: That is an excellent question that we have not considered in any way shape or form. There's lots of flexibility though there, I think. You know, is it the beginning of the fifth academic year that you're in office? So it essentially could be four and a half or five and half years. I think there's wiggle room in here.

TERRY: And I'm wondering if it would be wise to close the wiggle room or not, I mean, to just decide and say well it's the beginning of the third full calendar year or the third full academic year or something. I don't know.

DOWELL: Well, it seems to me the policy starts when the provost or the chancellor presents to the respective Council which deans are up for review. So at this point, it seems it's up for discretion of the leadership in that respect. I don't know if that's acceptable but that is wiggle room. I don't know if it's worth the effort to...

PLUCKER: And that's essentially current practice now, right? So...

HANSON: Among the things that makes things start – there are times – is whether or not there's consultation with the policy or advisory committees, how long it takes the Nomination Committee to come back and I notice that there's another step here that those committees then go on to the executive committees. The Agenda Committee of the Faculty Council so that's going to be another group that... And then after that there is the slight tension between B and C. It's the constitution of the committees that seems to be part of the [inaudible] among other things. Other things can add time too, but B says, "Only those individuals nominated by the UFC Agenda Committee shall be appointed" and then D suggests some other points.

MCROBBIE: Other questions or comments? Anybody on any of the other campuses got...? I hear somebody. Anybody on any of the other campuses? Any questions or comments? I think in that case I'm prepared to move the motion for adoption of this policy unless there's any final comments or questions from anybody? Alright, there being none, I'm going to put the motion. All those in favor of this policy – that's the motion – all those in favor, signify by saying 'Aye.' [Aye] And against, I suppose by 'Nay.'

DOWELL: You should probably wave your arms...

MCROBBIE: Wave your arms too just if you want to say, 'no.' I think that's carried unanimously, I believe. Alright, thank you Jonathan. Good work!

Let's, I was going to move on to agenda item 6 but Neil isn't here yet. So let's – I think we're a little ahead of time but not much, so why don't we jump to agenda item 7, if that's okay, Simon?

AGENDA ITEM 7: PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE TENURE CLOCK IN THE INDIANA UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF MEDICINE

ATKINSON: So this is an item for information and discussion about an action that was taken by the IUPUI Faculty Council at its – whatever meeting that was—March meeting?

UNKNOWN FEMALE SPEAKER: March.

ATKINSON: March meeting. It seems like it was longer ago than that. This is an action that was taken in response to an effort by the School of Medicine in particular to introduce more flexibility in the tenure clock for the faculty in the School of Medicine. So in the school – and this actually originally came mostly from the chairs of the basic science departments in the school of medicine that the regular seven year tenure clock reviewed beginning at year five, tenure at year seven, was no longer the universal standard in schools of medicine around the country. Many of the other schools, peer schools, around the country both public and private have started to introduce more flexibility in their procedures for tenure and promotion in the school. There are a number of reasons for this that reflects the changing environment for academic health centers and medical schools around the country. A lot of these are related to the pressures of obtaining research funding for faculty; the difficulty of the current funding climate for the faculty to establish their research programs, and establish a sustained research program that's able to attract continuing funding and to demonstrate that to the satisfaction of the promotion and tenure committees. The feeling in the school is that this is particularly acute for faculty have both research responsibilities and responsibilities for clinical work. The pressure of time for clinical work increasing based on particularly increased demands for documentation and compliance with a host of regulations that affect particularly things like writing notes in the hospital, and this means that whereas previously it was possible for somebody who was on one of the medical services to combine a day on the medical service with some time in their lab attending to their ongoing research program and writing grants and writing papers – that is really no longer possible for the faculty who have clinical responsibilities. When they're on clinical service, that is their whole day and they really don't have time during that period to devote themselves to their ongoing scholarly activities. So this is a problem that is particularly acute for faculty with clinical responsibilities. It's also been felt by much of the leadership in the school to be a problem that has adversely impacted the careers of women and minority faculty in the school. In that, particularly for women faculty who may wish to take time off to help balance family responsibilities with their responsibilities to the school, are in an even worse position than faculty who don't have to perhaps spend as much time attending to those responsibilities. So the leadership in the basic science departments brought this to the School of Medicine faculty

organization and also to the leadership of the school in an effort see whether there was a way to establish more flexibility in the tenure and promotion process for the faculty in the school and the general idea of how this would work is that first of all this would be done without altering the standards for tenure and promotion in the School of Medicine. That this would be done in a way that still allows faculty to go up for promotion and tenure in the normal timeline. Review at five years and tenure at year seven. But there would also be an option for faculty to elect to defer their promotion and tenure decision for a number of years beyond that normal clock. This was something that was then brought up to the campus faculty leadership, it's been discussed at the campus level for more than a year now, by the IFC Faculty Affairs Committee, by the Executive Committee of the IFC, and finally resulted in faculty affairs working with academic administration particularly Mary Fisher to craft a policy that would allow schools to adopt this kind of flexibility in their tenure clock if there was strong faculty support for doing so and if the school could show the dean of the faculties and the Faculty Council Executive Committee there were a number of safeguards in place for this policy. That there would be ongoing review of faculty who elected to take that longer tenure clock to avoid the problem of potentially stringing people along for additional years and then saying unexpectedly, 'well, your work is still not sufficient for promotion and tenure.' So there would be a very vigorous process of review that would be required by the dean of the faculties office.

There has to be strong faculty support for making this move. So it requires substantive discussion at the school level by the faculty with the administration and then an affirmative two-thirds vote of the faculty to go ahead with this process. It's also a process that can be rescinded if the school decides this is not working -- if faculty in the school decides that this is not working -- again by a faculty vote to reverse that policy. It's a policy that does not apply to people who are already here or who have already been hired into the tenure track. This would be a policy that applies to new hires after this policy went into effect for a particular school. It was discussed by the Indianapolis Faculty Council really at three meetings; once, as a potential administrative policy and twice as a policy of the Faculty Council and it [electronic noise, remark inaudible] by majority of roughly 50 to 15 -- something like that -- at the March IFC meeting. Now this policy is designed to fall within at least one interpretation of the IU *Handbook*. It's designed to be in compliance with the IU *Handbook*. I think there are arguments as to whether that is the case. This was the interpretation from the University Counsel's office that it was in compliance. I think it's obviously on the edge of what the *Handbook* might technically be read to allow. I don't think that's necessarily the most desirable way to go, and I think that the president has made it clear that he does not regard this as the most desirable way to go, and I'm sure he'll comment as we go on to discussion. Obviously, the more desirable way to go would be to make sure that the *Academic Handbook* language specifically allowed any policy related to promotion and tenure. That would require approval of the UFC for a change in the *Academic Handbook* by which and presumably the trustees would also need to weigh in on this. So that's the reason that we're discussing this at the UFC today. My sense is that those of us who

supported this policy on the IUPUI campus obviously want this to go forward and we would like to find whatever the shortest path to letting this go forward is.

UNKNOWN FEMALE SPEAKER: Simon, I wanted to clarify, at least in my mind, I guess, too, the proposed changes to the tenure clock could be in any school? Not just the School of Medicine?

ATKINSON: Yes, that's the way the IUPUI policy was crafted.

FISHER: Even though it was brought forward by the School of Medicine we felt it was important to craft a policy that, I mean if this—there's a lot of arguments about science and their funding that it could be something that relates to almost any school and that's why we wrote it in a general way.

MCROBBIE: I've – let me just state again, I think here that probably the best way for this to be approached is for this to be a matter that the UFC discusses, debates, and takes action on in the form of some kind of motion which I believe would then need to go to the trustees. My concern about the present course of action is that it is a creative interpretation of the *Handbook*. But I think the spirit of this policy would require it to go in some form to the trustees, as opposed to just being adopted. What I believe they understand to be the case is that we have a seven year tenure clock and this is effectively providing a *de facto* change for this across the board. Now I know there are the clever lawyerly arguments around this, but I think in the spirit of transparency with the trustees, this is going to be something – given this is a policy that they've approved in the past – this is something I think that needs ultimately to go to them, but I think it properly should go through the UFC. I mean I must say I do personally find the case for medicine to be a strong one, and I think if other schools have got similar cases no matter where they are, they should make those cases on the facts relevant to them at an appropriate point in time and these things be judged on a case by case basis. These area my own thoughts about this. I certainly would not want to see medicine being disadvantaged by this being slowed down in any way, but I think there are certain issues here of transparencies, both with the transparency with the trustees and how this policy may affect other campuses. For example, there are core schools that are based on this campus and vice versa. How does it affect the core school load as based on this campus with faculty in Indianapolis? And I'm sure that's going to be of some concern here. I don't know what people on the regional campuses think about this. We haven't heard from anybody yet, but... So I, from the chair, I've got some definite concerns about how we should move forward here. I really think the UFC needs to weigh in and express a view on this matter. So, let me open it up for debate. Comments, questions? Yes, somebody at IUPUI? Oh Mary, yeah?

FISHER: Well the one thing I wanted to mention was that currently we see individual faculty can come forward and ask for extensions of their tenure clock which every campus does even though it's not mentioned anywhere in the *Handbook* that this

happens. When there's been a death in the family or someone is ill or the faculty member is ill or there has been a change in their research focus or a grant didn't quite get funded, the dean of faculties on every campus is able to extend the tenure clock, usually at one year increments. The practice generally has been to do this as much as two times for an individual, frequently it's only one time. What we've seen is a pattern is that probably 80% of the extensions we get – I'm guessing now just from my own experience the last couple of years – have been requests from medicine for extensions of the tenure clock. So we are doing this basically on an individual basis relative to life events and life situations and the reality of research changes and whatnot for individual faculty. And that's been a mechanism that's been in place for a great number of years. That's also not reflected in the *Handbook* anywhere that needs to be addressed as we deal with this issue I think that issue also should be addressed.

MCROBBIE: That's a fair comment, Mary. Yes? Sorry, I can't see who you are, but it's somebody at IUPUI.

PACKER: Subah Packer. I just want to point out that there is some concern amongst faculty even in the School of Medicine that they're not fully informed of the possible untoward consequences of changing to an extended provisional period. And also some concern that if the basis for the argument to make the change is based on the need to require specifically NIH funding that this in fact also would go against the *Handbook*, as it stipulates in the *Handbook* that there should not be any pressure to get any specific kind of external funding to support one's creative activities. The other thing is that the NIH – the state of NIH funding right now – is such that one wonders if, 'oh, this is going to be kind of a moot point,' because it really doesn't look like it's going to be a sustainable way of carrying on a research mission, unless something drastically changes. So are we making a criterion for tenure that is unattainable? So I think that we probably need to have the forums that are suggested in the current policy within the School of Medicine to see what the faculty at large really think of this before we perhaps need to go to the board of trustees.

FISHER: And I think what's happening within the School of Medicine, I think, is the need for forums is going to build into the policy. So the communication that's necessary within the School of Medicine is part of that process that's been set up. And that does need to happen, but again, the campus voted pretty strongly that this policy is important to us.

MCROBBIE: Yes?

BURNS: Yes, I want to say that I'm sympathetic to the complexities and reason for extending it, but I want to support the notion that turning over something as important as judgment of tenure and academic achievement/scholarly activity to some external set of events in the rationale is not – you know, tying it to the funding changes or things like that, I mean – we would need a university that can persevere independent of what

the government may or may not be doing at any particular decade. So I support some of the complexities of working in a clinical environment and having multiple hats one's wearing while trying to get tenure. That's complex, but we've got to be very careful not to tie it to external agencies, I think.

MCROBBIE: Other comments?

DOWELL: Well, I'll jump in. I think it is very necessary that we consider how the UFC can consider the issue itself. This is a very fundamental part of something that we share as faculty on all the campuses, and while I am also very sympathetic to the School of Medicine's case, I think that this sort of releasing this type of judgment to the decision of an individual campus is a mistake, and I agree with President McRobbie that the board of trustees would probably view it that way too. And we need to figure out if there's a way either for UFC to adopt something brief that would allow the IUPUI policy to move forward or simply to take the IUPUI policy under advisement by the UFC for how it might be implemented on a wider view, you know, a wider scope.

HORNE: May I ask a question?

DOWELL: Yeah.

HORNE: Sorry, my name's Brian Horne. I'm in the School of Music here in Bloomington. I'm curious – I have nothing to do with this but I'm curious. Two short questions: first of all, do you feel if this policy is not adopted and there is no change do you feel that you would suffer from a recruiting standpoint – a recruiting faculty standpoint?

FISHER: That's the issue.

MCROBBIE: Simon, can you respond to that?

ATKINSON: Yeah, that's certainly the feeling of the leadership in the School of Medicine. The feeling is that they already are suffering from a recruiting standpoint. That several faculty hires have gone elsewhere because they've been attracted by the additional flexibility in the tenure clock at other institutions.

HORNE: Thank you. And this really – I think by the time one would get to that position to be hired into a faculty position there – this is probably not relevant to most people – but do you feel in any sense that to some individuals we would actually be doing a disservice to allow them to postpone the decision and postpone the decision until... For instance, I was tenured and promoted at a previous institution and had to give that up to come here. It was worth it to be hired at the Jacobs School of Music here in Bloomington, Indiana, so I did it, but I was very afraid that if I weren't granted tenure at the end of that I would be very close to 50 having to look for another position and you know that was on my mind and I'm curious. To me, in that sense, it was better to get it

earlier rather than later. Do you think in any way there's a consideration that perhaps we might do a disservice to people?

ATKINSON: [break in recording remark lost] jump in, but I must say that one thing that's happening now as a way for the school to circumvent some of these problems is that people are being hired in large numbers into either the clinical or the research ranks where they don't have the prospect of the protections of tenure at all, and then if at such time as they show themselves to be successful, then they may be transferred over into the tenure track ranks. And so that's effectively prolonging the clock for those people without any of the protections of tenure.

MCRROBBIE: Thank you.

ATKINSON: I think Sue wanted to say something.

PACKER: I just want to point out that the gender issue has to be considered. It's not just about attracting faculty in the first place. It's also about retention. And, you know, the idea that women need to take time off to have babies or something is actually not supported by the data. The data that is worrisome is that women do not acquire NIH funding at the same rate as do their male colleagues, and if we make NIH funding the criteria for tenure, we will not be retaining female faculty members in the School of Medicine in the tenure track. No matter how long. It makes it worse.

MCRROBBIE: Other comments or questions. Yes?

GIERYN: A question for our colleagues in Indianapolis, and particularly out of the School of Medicine. How urgent is it that this policy be adopted now? It has been adopted on the Indianapolis campus. Is there a reason to believe that there would be additional suffering in terms of retention and recruitment of faculty if this policy were deliberated on the remaining campuses and considered as a proposal for a change to the *Academic Handbook*?

FISHER: Well, I'm not from the School of Medicine. I know that the leadership of the School of Medicine is very anxious to move this forward. You know, I think you would want to hear from them. They've written, by the way, a very...

PACKER: But I think we need to faculty for us. We need the faculty at large to have input and that really has not yet happened.

GIERYN: Fair enough.

ATKINSON: The faculty forums have not happened. It's not true to say that the faculty haven't had a chance to weigh in and the faculty were able to vote on this and you have the results of that voting in one of the addenda that was sent which shows considerable

support from all ranks, all ages, of both genders of faculty. So these forums were built into the policy so that this decision can happen in an informed way. I don't think we want to get stuck in a catch-22 where we can't have the forums until we adopt the policy and we can't adopt the policy until we have the forum.

MCROBBIE: Laverne?

NISHIHARA: This is Laverne Nishihara from IU East. I have a question for IUPUI. Whether there was any discussion of limiting the extended tenure clock to those faculty members who do not draw a standard salary from IU but depend on grants for that?

FISHER: No.

ATKINSON: No, that wasn't discussed. I think we took the view that we didn't want to divide our faculty up that way.

PACKER: Well, the tenure agreement is that they will have salaries supported from the university. That's the tenure agreement. That's the tenure in the *Handbook* that's primary to the *Handbook*. So that should be a non-issue.

NISHIHARA: I'm asking because that was a big issue with the white paper from the IU School of Medicine, but I didn't notice it as much from the standing committees' report from the IFC, so I wanted to ask that question.

PACKER: I think that's one of the things at faculty forums that needs to be discussed, because it goes against the *Handbook* to have tenured faculty on soft money salaries.

MCROBBIE: Herb.

TERRY: That was basically my comment as one of the things I took away from the white paper; that the School of Medicine obviously has a faculty structure that it cannot support except by counting in that research money and clinical income. It's overextended. Dramatically. And apparently other medical schools are. That's apparently the practice of the field. But I, too, would argue that that seems to be contrary to the *Handbook* as it currently reads.

MCGREGOR: Yeah, so a follow up question. Bill McGregor in the School of Public and Environmental Affairs. What is the IU Policy with regard to having outside clinical income? Can a medical school faculty member have a private practice? I noticed for example on the list, Yale is clearly is one of those schools that does not allow private practice. People will leave schools like that to go to other schools that do permit private income. And so it's a very complex policy I think that is trying to be crafted. What is the IU situation?

ATKINSON: The situation is that the faculty of the school all belong to a – the faculty with clinical responsibilities – belong to a practice plan that is essentially owned by the faculty in that particular practice group, and the clinical income flows into that practice plan and then some of the clinical income from the practice plan flows to the School of Medicine and some of it is divided up amongst the faculty that are part of the practice plan.

MCRROBBIE: Other – Herb?

TERRY: It seems to me as if there are two separate issues. One, is whether this makes any sense in the Indiana University School of Medicine, and the medical school has obviously decided it does. The other is whether the campus would have the authority to allow schools to set up different tenure clocks or whether that's something that has to be decided by the University Faculty Council and ultimately by the trustees. And I think it should be something that's decided ultimately by our trustees to be very honest. And certainly we should weigh in on it, but that's ultimately a trustee policy. I would recommend that we ask the Agenda Committee of the University Faculty Council to devise a system to have the question of differential tenure clocks or extended tenure clocks brought back to the UFC as early as possible. I'm tempted to say April, but as early as possible.

MCRROBBIE: I would say April.

TERRY: I mean we have to get it on the trustees' calendar as well.

MCRROBBIE: I was going to say something exactly like that. Thank you for suggesting that!

TERRY: And see if we can't move this along and get it back to us. And okay...

MCRROBBIE: And maybe picking up Mary's point too about using this as a way of trying to update the faculty handbook on a few issues like, you know, formally recognizing the appropriate campus official having the ability to give extensions, etc. etc.. This may be an opportunity to clean up a few other things as well.

TERRY: Clean up obvious things, let's say that.

MCRROBBIE: Can I ask the meeting and the meeting out there in cyberland if they're agreeable to the sense of what Herb has suggested? That we ask the Agenda Committee to look at how – based on the needs that have been expressed at IUPUI – how we might fashion an actual policy proposal to bring back for voting on and adoption hopefully at the April meeting? Does that seem like a reasonable way to proceed? Are people happy to proceed that way? [General 'yes' from the Council] Is that agreeable?

ATKINSON: I was just hoping somebody else would say that.

FISHER: I was thinking that it could be a worked policy statement that basically said that from time to time the campuses may have unique needs and may propose to the trustees directly, you know, changes in the tenure clock or this policy could be proposed by UFC for its adoption, which I think is a more complicated thing.

MCROBBIE: Or something like that. Why don't we take that as agreed and we'll get the Agenda Committee to work on that and let's move things forward in that way. Alright, good, thanks.

ATKINSON: I'm sure the Agenda Committee would welcome any suggestions from anyone on the UFC...

MCROBBIE: Okay.

ATKINSON: ...or outside.

MCROBBIE: Alright, good. Thanks. Simon or anybody else, any final comments on this matter before we move on?

PACKER: I have one final comment, and that is I just want to bring it to everybody's attention that the information that was provided as, you know, from faculty in the School of Medicine when they were asked to give input on this potential policy that I think that a lot of the faculty – first of all, resulting in a return rate but about a third of the faculty and so the numbers you're looking at represent naturally a small number of the faculty in general. And I think that it also may be that a lot of the people who voted may not have had a full discussion of the pros and cons. So I really think it is important that that take place regardless of whether we adopt the policy for one school or another or all schools.

MCROBBIE: Thank you. Alright, let's now move back to agenda item 6 which is going to be a discussion of budget and financial issues by the CFE/CFO Neil Theobald.

AGENDA ITEM 6: DISCUSSION OF UNIVERSITY BUDGET ISSUES

THEOBALD: I have a handout in your packet here. One side says, "Current Financial Context," and the other, "Financing Plan Going Forward." So to give us some basis for the discussion, this goes through where we've been since the legislature passed the budget in June, where we are currently, and where we're going. In June of this last year, the budget passed by the General Assembly cut IU's state appropriation by \$22.2 million dollars. At the same time, using federal stimulus dollars, the state backfilled that cut. So we were not required this year to make a budget cut based on what the General Assembly had done in June, but the president made the decision that we would go

ahead and begin implementing the cut so that we didn't set up a funding cliff at the end of the biennium when the federal money ran out. The way we did that on the first page, the first two items numbered items there, whenever a non-faculty member left we allowed units to replace one non-faculty member for every two that left and we cut non-faculty travel by 50%. In addition although University Administration doesn't receive any state appropriation, and so they weren't actually impacted by the state's action, we extended the budget reduction the same percentage reduction to University Administration to give us some flexibility there. That gives us about another million and one. As the table shows in the middle of that page, the budget reduction has been fully implemented at this point. The bottom chart is the majority of this has come by eliminating 237 non-faculty positions. In other words as people left as I mentioned, for every two that left we were only able to hire one, and therefore at this point we have 237 fewer non-faculty employees than we did at the beginning of the year, which has saved in the right column \$13.2 million. Just quickly how that chart works, of all of our employees obviously, a large number are paid through indirect cost recovery similar to the discussion in the last agenda item. You take those out, those aren't funded from IU funds, clearly. And then IU, the far right column is the people that are actually paid by IU. So we have saved \$13.2 million on those people that haven't been replaced by IU funding. So that's how we got to where we are now. Where we're going from here is the state budget cut also includes another \$7.1 million dollars in budget cuts next year. That's additive to the cut this year. So the cut for the biennium is 29.3 million as laid out above. Again, we were supposed to have backfill from the federal stimulus money, so that we didn't need to make those cuts. We decided to make the cuts and as we'll see in the end here that worked out quite well for us.

The cuts for next year are being covered by the five items in the middle of the second page there. We're continuing the same budget cuts as we had last year so in other words those 237 positions are not coming back. We start from that lower basis going forward. We are consolidating purchasing across the university. We had seven purchasing units and evidence – this has been in place for about a month – in contracts we are receiving with significant savings by buying in bulk rather than buying retail so that's a significant cost savings. We are going to include the cost of 18/20 when we renegotiate the indirect cost recovery rate this year. We are requiring three year vesting for any faculty and staff hired after August 31 of this year. They will have to have 3 years if they're going to keep their employer share of TIAA/CREF if they were to leave IU and the last is to recalculate the formula for overtime pay. Currently if you're sick on a Friday and work on a Saturday you get overtime on Saturday. Sick leave wouldn't count towards overtime. You'd actually have to work forty hours in order to get overtime pay. So those are the changes that generate the remainder of the savings.

Those are ongoing savings. So this was the plan we basically put in over the course of the year. Now in December right before Christmas those of you that were paying attention to this, the state in addition cut our budget by \$58 million dollars, okay? Now the difference between what the General Assembly did in June and this cut that came

out of the governor's office in December was that the cut in June is recurring dollars. So that basically had to be people or things that are base funded that we pay for every year. The cut in December was cash – one time only. We just had to find \$58 million dollars.

MCROBBIE: Northwest – sorry Neil – Northwest could you mute your sound? Thank you.

THEOBALD: So the way we're covering the \$58 million dollar cut is, as I mentioned, we started making the budget cuts immediately even though we were promised backfill. So we didn't incur those expenses. You know, we cut the travel budgets immediately. We began the savings on non-faculty leaving immediately so we didn't have to provide the backfill. So the bulk of the cut we're making of the \$58 million are savings we had already realized by making the budget cuts immediately rather than waiting two years as the federal stimulus dollars would have allowed. So that's the biggest piece of it. That's \$51 and half million of the \$58. The rest of it comes from R & R is being cut – that's remodeling of buildings, renovation and remodeling of buildings – the state funds for that are going down by \$6 million dollars as you see, so therefore Vice President Morrison is scaling back those projects. And there are special funding for eight units that were cut by half a million dollars by the state. So that's how we're implementing the cut. Going forward from here, we are required by state law to approve tuition rates for two years at a time and we did that last year. So our tuition rates are already set for the next academic year. The resident undergraduate rate will go up 4.9% at Indianapolis and Bloomington and 4.7% at the regional campuses and then the rates for graduate programs and non-residents will vary across the various schools and the various campuses. On the spending side, the biggest decision still to be made is whether we'll be able to have a salary increase next year. At this point, the president has – given the very unsettled nature of the state budget – we're deferring that decision going forward. And so if the state's financial situation markedly improves, if our enrollments remain strong and the initial indication is they will, then our goal will be to allow campuses to provide an increase. Clearly, we'll know much more after April. That's a big tax month for the state so we know what's happened with income taxes for the state and obviously enrollments we'll know in September. As far as the other financial decisions that are being made, I assume we're going through—we're certainly going through budget conferences that finish in Bloomington and Indianapolis. The university tax that is charged out to the campuses will go down \$400,000 next year.

MCROBBIE: That's the first time that's ever happened I think.

THEOBALD: As someone who's been involved in paying that for a number of years, it's the first time that I know of it going down! So it will go down \$400,000 and then at IUPUI in Bloomington, the campus level assessments are pretty well set, but as soon as those are final and then there's chancellor's fund allocations in Indianapolis, provost fund allocations here in Bloomington, that's the last piece to be put together and then

we begin budget construction with the goal of having the budget put together by mid-April. So that's the overview. What questions/concerns do you have of what's going on here?

MCRORBIE: Questions for Neil? Questions?

EVANS: One question on the indirect recovery. Do you have any data of how effective that's actually been?

THEOBALD: In terms of charging...

EVANS: In terms of overall, I mean, dollars.

THEOBALD: What's it cost? What's been saved? Effectiveness...?

EVANS: Yes, effectiveness and is this practically a tax on grants? The government giving us the same amount of money and we...

THEOBALD: No, the indirect cost recovery rate is in addition to what the grant is – the amount of money to spend for the grants. This won't affect the amount of money available for direct operations on the grant, yet what we do now is anytime we get a grant and as somebody that receives 18/20 benefits we charge the schools for the tax. That's part of the assessments, campus assessments. So instead of charging that out as an assessment to the schools, we're going to charge that negotiate to charge that to the federal government as part of indirect cost recovery rate. So that's in addition to the direct expenditures I'm bringing.

EVANS: Is the federal government buying this?

MCRORBIE: Every university negotiates its indirect cost recovery every couple of years so this is just going to be part of what we will attempt to negotiate with them.

EVANS: So my question is how successful has that negotiation been? They can say no...

THEOBALD: We're just starting.

MCRORBIE: Yeah.

THEOBALD: Now this is the only benefit rate we don't charge, so it is unique. In the past there has not been significant pushback on all the other benefit rates we charge, so but we'll [inaudible] procedure.

MCRORBIE: Questions? Questions? Questions? Alright, thank you very much.

THEOBALD: Thanks!

AGENDA ITEM 8: CONSTITUTIONAL REFORM OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY COUNCIL

MCROBBIE: Agenda Item 8, constitutional reform of the UFC and this is going to be Erika and Simon? Who wants to open the batting as we say, Simon, where we come from?

ATKINSON: I can do that. I think a number of us have felt over the last few years that our faculty governance mechanisms are not particularly effective and that's a particularly acute problem at the university wide level. It's hard to get a quorum for UFC meetings and it was hard to get a quorum when we held in-person meetings when we went around to different locations. It's hard to get a quorum for the video conference meetings. And I'm not sure what people's feelings are but the quality of our discussion at the video meetings is not what it was for the in person meetings. So it seems to me that there's a question to be asked about the effectiveness of the UFC as an institution for bringing faculty governance for the university. And so I think it's time, and I think the Agenda Committee is agreed, that it's time that we took a look at the university wide structure of faculty governance. I think that's also a conversation that needs to needs perhaps to happen at each of campus levels. I know that's a conversation that's already going on in Bloomington and maybe Erika can talk a little bit about that. I think it's a conversation that we need to have in Indianapolis too. The issue right now is the future structure of the UFC. We've had a couple of discussions about this at the Agenda Committee over a few meetings now. And I think we're coming to a consensus that for many purposes a leaner, meaner UFC is perhaps going to be a more effective institution than the current structure. What a leaner, meaner UFC looks like – I think that it may look something very like the current UFC Agenda Committee where there are representatives from all campuses, so all the faculty governance leaders from all the campuses are represented and then there are a small number of additional representatives, perhaps a couple each from Bloomington, Indianapolis and perhaps a couple of at-large representatives at the regional campuses collectively. There would be very few if any administration representatives besides the president. Perhaps somebody in the equivalent of John Applegate's position. I would use the title but it keeps changing, so...It has a lot of p's in it. [laughter] So this would be a small body. It would be easy to meet by video conference or teleconference and easier to get a small body like this together in person. It would be a body that meets frequently with the president so that the president could seek input from the faculty on the decisions that he needs to make and this body can make the faculty's views known to the president. If there is a sense that this is something that the UFC is on board with then I think what we would do is to appoint a very small group, perhaps three or four people, to look at what would be the necessary changes to the faculty constitution to make this happen. If there are other models that people want to entertain we can certainly look at those. Erika do you have anything you want to add to that?

DOWELL: Well, let's see. We have I think a consensus at the UFC Agenda Committee meetings that the members of the Agenda Committee right now are certainly in favor of looking at this. I would reinforce the fact that there would be representation from every campus in addition to some more people and I can say that this is something that Bloomington is also looking at. I think Bloomington is looking at effectiveness of faculty governance in perhaps a broader way. I don't think in BFC our concerns are particularly about the size of the group, but rather about what our priorities are, how we function, what kinds of committees we have and what our relationships are with schools and with the administration, the president, and so forth. And so I think we'd be interested in hearing back from every campus maybe not right now but whatever this ad hoc group is or right now, I guess we not shutting down conversation right now. But to get a sense of what campuses would like to see happen and because we do want this to be a group that is representative but also one that's functional. And certainly if you look at any set of the minutes of the UFC, the list of those present is rivaled by the list of those not present. So I think we're looking to align the UFC to reality in a lot of respects as well as to make it leaner and meaner.

MCROBBIE: Thanks, Erika. Other comments/questions? Yes, Laverne?

NISHIHARA: This is Laverne Nishihara from IU East. IU East has two representatives to UFC, the Senate President, myself, and an elected UFC representative Hitesh Kathuria. I've spoken with Hitesh, I've spoken to the recent Senate Presidents and the recent UFC reps from East and our strong feeling is we cannot shrink the number representatives from East, that is two of us. We have not had problems showing up for the video conferences or teleconferences. Meeting quorum for East has not been a problem, but East is extremely reluctant to give up what little representation we have. So I'm glad to hear at least each regional campus will have representation but I just want to put it out there that East does not want to sink below the number of two.

GALLMEIER: Chuck Gallmeier IU Northwest. We wouldn't like to shrink more than two either.

SQUIRES: This is Fran from IU Southeast. We would also like to maintain two representatives.

HINNEFELD: It seems to be a concern at South Bend as well among some of my colleagues. We have a, I mean, there is a feeling I believe that the problems with quorum are generally not due to lack of attendance from the far flung campuses, from the regional campuses. So I mean that's just an observation. I'm not sure that that's true. Craig could probably give us a better reading on that. My sense is that the problem is not with the far flung campuses. I do at the same time feel that it's [inaudible] current structure so this second year as president at South Bend and last year the problem was that we couldn't get quorum [inaudible] move to Indianapolis to Southeast last year and this year this is in some ways an effective alternative but to me

it's not nearly an ideal alternative. It's not a very effective way to hold meetings of this large group either. I don't really have a suggestion for an ideal solution to this quandary but it's not clear at the regional campuses that scaling back on our representation serves us well.

DOWELL: Understood.

ROSS: John Ross in Kokomo. I'll just agree with the rest at the regional level that two is pretty small and we've generally gotten to the meetings. And a lot of people I knew in Bloomington seemed to be on UFC, but never go. They may have had class then and it didn't prevent them from being on the UFC.

BURNS: I just wanted to make a comment that separate from the quorum issue is there's times where having a broader constituency is useful, and you may want to also as you look at this think more in terms of just an Agenda Committee become an executive committee so you've got an actionable executive committee but a broader committee you can draw on for areas where you may need to tackle wider diversity of members.

MCRROBBIE: Other comments/questions? Herb?

TERRY: I think the issue of administrative membership for representation in the UFC is also important. I hate to separate the terms, but there's the concept of faculty governance. How do we make our contributions to the governance of the institution, and shared governance which is working with the administration and with the trustees in the governance and the institution. And I would hope that as we review the UFC which has been to some extent an institution of shared governance, presided over by the president, chancellors and provosts as members, and that sort of thing that we consider not just the efficiency of the functioning of the faculty part of shared governance but that we also look at how that will integrate with the administration and we can use as a starting point some of the observations in the president's state of the university address. I'm not sure I share his model for when faculty should be concerned and when they shouldn't, but I admire him for laying it out and saying here's an important thing to consider. And we should.

MCRROBBIE: Other comments? Questions?

BONSALL: May I make a comment?

MCRROBBIE: Sure.

BONSALL: My name is James Bonsall. I'm a regional campus student representative on the UFC and I would actually like to make sure that – I would hope that there would still be maybe a couple of students on this new leaner, meaner UFC. I do vastly appreciate

the opportunity to contribute to at least give our opinions on different things that the university does, so we'd have to make sure at least students are included somewhere in this too, so that we can contribute –

FISHER: We cannot hear the speaker.

MCROBBIE: The speaker is a student representative at...where did you say you were? Southeast?

BONSALL: IU South.

MCROBBIE: Who just made the case for continuing student representation. Any other questions or comments? Yes, Herb again?

TERRY: Maybe building on Steve's observation, another thing this group might quickly look at would be committee structure. I'm not sure that's optimal at all. Many of our committees haven't functioned very well. We do by the way for your information have the Facilities and Finance Committee up and running. And we'll talk to Neil tomorrow about some additional budget issues, so that committee is actually getting something done this year, but we should talk about it. It might be that you want to empower committees to take action on something and recommend it to the Executive Committee and then you would make sure that the regional campuses were represented in committees on specific issues and might get more expertise in the committees. I don't know. The interplay between the body as a whole and its committee structure would also be worth taking a look at.

HORNE: I'd like to make a comment. This is perhaps—this is Brian Horne in Bloomington again—and this is perhaps, well it's for certain more nuts and bolts than we've talked about. You're talking about more philosophical issues, but what's been difficult for me is that I'm on the Bloomington Faculty Council and I have to set aside 3:30-5:30 every Tuesday for that and that's fine. But then when this meets this is 1:30-4:30 so effectively I can't have anything from 1:30-5:30 on Tuesdays and when the teleconference meets it's from 11-12:30. And so effectively I have to set out 11-5:30 on Tuesdays if I'm never going to miss it and I can't do that. You know, and especially in what I do, it's not a class. You know when everybody's affected. I do a great deal of individual lessons so that one person doesn't get the same thing as everybody else if they happen to have like someone did today, a lesson at 1:30. I have to find another time when he and everybody else is available. And it would seem to me if we're going to plan it would be very nice to see if we could find a time, for instance 3:30-5:30 that everything happens. 3:30-5:30 on Tuesdays and then we just set that aside and then I could always be there. But I can't, and I don't know anybody who could, set aside 11-5:30 every Tuesday for the semester hoping or planning so that at the time when it happens three times a semester or however many times, just as a logistical note.

MCROBBIE: Sorry, someone trying to get in? Someone on another campus wanting to comment? No? Any other comments from anybody else?

DOWELL: I would suggest that if anyone is particularly interested in volunteering to serve on this committee of three or four people to let Simon or I know. We'd like to, I think, appoint them soon.

TERRY: I would throw one other, very controversial idea out based on this discussion, I guess. In the years I've been around the UFC, I've often discovered things proceed relatively well until the School of Medicine notices them and then suddenly they sometimes get diverted or the School of Medicine brings something like this to us without even coming to this presentation except through Simon. It may be that the School of Medicine should be looked at as another unit of faculty governance. We've treated it as part of IUPUI, but I don't know – and it may be that things would work more smoothly for them and us if they had some representation on this group. I'm going to throw that out. They're a large part of us and they're different in many important ways.

MCROBBIE: Okay, thank you Herb. Other comments or questions? Comments or questions?

WOLF: I have a comment here from Fort Wayne, mostly about Vice President Applegate's mission here. On the website it says that you're kind of coordinating among the five regional campuses. I guess my question is, I know that we're kind of a hybrid system here, but we're not one of those five. Are you not, are we part of this or what's your vision of our role up here in Fort Wayne or is it just a mistake on the website?

APPLEGATE: I wouldn't have chosen the five number actually, but Fort Wayne is obviously a more even combination of the IU and PU parts of the system and so the IU program's very much a part of that.

MCROBBIE: Well, just on the agenda, we're on the last agenda item 7, any comments on that agenda item? Any final comments? Sorry, pardon me, agenda item 8? Any final comments on that? Alright ladies and gentlemen, before my voice gives out we are adjourned. Thank you very much.